

HONORING CASEY AND JEAN  
BROWN

## HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to acknowledge two up-standing citizens of Western Colorado, Casey and Jean Brown. Casey and Jean, through their determination and 'old fashioned' hard work have built a reputation among Colorado's rodeo community. This dedication was recently rewarded when the couple received the Western Service Award, presented by the Du-rango Pro Rodeo.

Casey and Jean understand the value and benefit of working hard and this is evident in their day to day routine running their family ranch. Jean plays the dual role of mother and bookkeeper on the ranch. The tasks of her typical day range from patching up her rodeo bruised husband, to helping care for her chil-dren, to ensuring the health of the family's livestock.

Before coming to Colorado, Casey could be found behind the teacher's desk at California Polytechnic College. After moving to Colorado, Casey and Jean began the legacy of service to their community that they are now widely known for. Working as a rancher, Casey realized that many ranchers like himself needed assistance in the political arena. To aid others like himself, he served with distinction on the Colorado Wool Growers and Cattleman's As-sociations. In addition, he has also served on the National Public Lands Council and the Pine River Irrigation District.

The commitment of these two individuals to family and community is truly commendable. They have found that, through dedication and hard work, a person can truly do anything that the mind desires. They have made a true im-pact upon the community of Durango and they are clearly deserving of this prestigious award from the Durango Pro Rodeo Association.

Casey and Jean, I thank you for your com-mitment to helping others. The citizens of Du-rango are truly privileged to call you neighbor and friend. Congratulations!

## INCARCERATION OF ZHANG JIE

## HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, May 15, 2000.

ZHU RONGJI ZONGLI,  
Premier of the People's Republic of China,  
Guowuyuan, Beijingshi, People's Republic  
of China.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: We are writing to ex-press our strong concern regarding the incar-ceration of Zhang Jie and to request that you urge the appropriate officials to release information related to his imprisonment and state of being.

Zhang Jie was a 23-year old unemployed worker from Jinan, Shangdong Province,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

when, on June 5th, 1989, he was alleged to have organized a rally and denounced the killing of protestors in Tiananmen Square the previous day. Zhang Jie was given an 18-year sentence for "counter revolutionary in-citement." Jie was last reported in 1992 to be in Shangdong Prison Number 3, also known as Weifang Shengjian Machinery Works.

Given our understanding that Zhang Jie was exercising his basic right to freedom of expression—and neither undertook, nor called for, any violent action—we are seri-ously disturbed by the severity of his sen-tence. We are also concerned that those in-volved in international humanitarian efforts to secure his release have been unable to learn anything about his condition. This is all the more distressful when we hear that workers such as Zhang Jie have been sub-jected to harsh treatment.

The American people await some sign of progress from the leadership of the People's Republic of China in the treatment of those who speak out on matters of conscience. We call on you to personally ensure that the proper authorities will cooperate and look forward to our request for information on Zhang Jie's status.

Sincerely,

Lynn Woolsey, Luis V. Gutierrez, Martin Frost, Tom Lantos, George Miller, Peter De Fazio, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Major R. Owens, ———, Nancy Pelosi, Christopher Shays, Sam Farr, Cynthia McKinney, Pete Stark, Sherrod Brown, Lloyd Doggett.

## HONORING JOE COLLINS

## HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to commend the Honorable Joe Collins on his remarkable service as Rio Blanco County Commissioner. Joe is stepping down after serving his community for nearly 15 years as Commissioner. Joe's commitment to bettering his community has ensured that Rio Blanco County will be a better place for its citizens.

Joe is a long time resident of Rio Blanco County and truly understands what is im-portant to his community. As commissioner, he fought to ensure the safety of western Colo-rado's land and water resources. Under-standing the importance of serving his fellow Coloradans, Joe has also been involved with a number of different public interest organiza-tions. Joe put his outstanding leadership quali-ties to use as a member of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, the Rio Blanco County Cattlemen's Board of Directors, the Local Forest Service Advisory Board, and as Chair-man of both the Regional Transportation Board and the Associated Governments of Northwest Colorado.

Joe, you have served your community, State, and Nation admirably, and on behalf of the State of Colorado and the U.S. Congress, I thank you. The leadership that you have given to Rio Blanco County will be greatly missed.

Good luck in your future endeavors.

MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF REC-  
ONCILIATION ACT OF 2000—VETO  
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

## HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to sec-tion 4022(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, I am submitting for the RECORD the complexity analysis for H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Rec-onciliation Act of 2000 prepared by the Internal Revenue Service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

Washington, DC, July 31, 2000.

MS. LINDY L. PAULL,  
Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Taxation,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. PAULL: I am writing to comment on your complexity analysis of the con-ference agreement on H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Reconciliation Act of 2000 (the "Act"). Because time constraints prevented your staff from consulting the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Department of the Treasury prior to issuing the Conference Re-port, I would like to take this opportunity to point out two additional issues concerning the conference agreement.

First, having the increased standard deduc-tion, wider 15-percent bracket, and higher Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) phaseout range apply to tax year 2000 will require sig-nificant changes to the IRS 2000 tax forms and processing programs. If the legislation is enacted before mid-September 2000, we should have no problem in timely imple-menting the required changes. Later enact-ment could adversely impact distribution and processing of individual income tax re-turns for tax year 2000.

Second, Section 6 of the Act relating to es-timated taxes creates complications for both taxpayers and the IRS. Taxpayers are gen-erally required to make quarterly payments of estimated taxes and/or withholding at least equal to 25 percent of the lesser of (i) 90 percent of the tax shown on their return for the taxable year or (ii) 100 percent (108.6 per-cent for certain high income taxpayers) of the tax shown on the tax return for the prior year. Estimated tax penalties are imposed on underpayments of required installments.

Section 6 of the Act prevents tax year 2000 changes from being taken into account in de-termining the amount of any estimated tax installments due before October 1, 2000. Therefore, the required installments for married taxpayers for the first three quar-ters of tax year 2000 (and the penalties for their underpayment) will not be based on the tax shown on the taxpayer's 2000 tax return. Instead, they will be based on the tax that "would have been" shown on the taxpayer's 2000 tax return had the bill not been enacted. Section 6 will create confusion and com-plexity for taxpayers who must determine the amount of estimated tax payments due for the remainder of tax year 2000 and who want to make adjustments in the amount of their taxes withheld. It also presents a trap for taxpayers who know about their reduced liability due to the Act but who are not aware of Section 6 of the Act.

The biggest problem with Section 6, however, is the burden imposed on married taxpayers who wish to do their own computation of their estimated tax penalty for tax year 2000 (even if only to determine whether they have a penalty), or to verify the IRS' computation of the penalty. These taxpayers will need to complete Form 2210, Underpayment of Estimated Tax by Individuals, Estates, and Trusts. They will not be able to use the Short Method, but will be required to use the much more complicated Regular Method. Married taxpayers will be directed to complete Part II of Form 2210 twice. First, they will compute their required installments for the first three quarters of 2000 using their "would have been" 2000 tax. Next, they will compute their required installment for the fourth quarter using their actual 2000 tax. The instructions for Form 2210 will be expected to include the tax rate schedules, worksheets, EITC phase-out adjustments, etc. that married taxpayers will need to compute their "would have been" tax for 2000.

In addition, to the above-mentioned modifications to the 2000 Form 2210, the IRS will need to modify its tax year 2000 Form 1040 processing and estimated tax penalty processing to take into account the "would have been" 2000 tax for married taxpayers in determining their required installments for the first three quarters. While these modifications are not difficult, they will consume a significant amount of our programming resources over a short period of time (three staff years before the end of 2000). Since our programming resources for tax year 2000 processing (in 2001) are already fully committed, implementing Section 6 presents problems for the IRS.

If you have any questions, please call. I will be happy to meet with you to discuss any of these issues.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. ROSSOTTI.

#### INTRODUCTION OF NO GUNS FOR VIOLENT PERPETRATORS ACT

#### HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I join with ten of my colleagues in introducing legislation that will keep guns out of the hands of our most violent criminals.

In my twelve years as an elected District Attorney, I found that to the victim of a violent crime it makes little difference whether the perpetrator was an adult or a juvenile. I believe we all can agree that violent persons should not be able to legally possess a firearm.

We already have legislation that makes it illegal for convicted felons to possess a firearm. But a loophole allows people who were convicted of violent crimes when they were juveniles to possess firearms. This is a narrow loophole that should be closed.

This loophole was brought to my attention by one of my constituents, Bob Lockett, who owns a gun store in my district. An individual with a conviction for a shooting death as a juvenile in California tried to purchase gun parts at his store. I commend Mr. Lockett for bringing this serious matter to my attention, and I

agree with him that these individuals with a violent past should be prohibited from possessing firearms. And although the state of Kansas has this law, I believe that this should be a federal law to prevent violent perpetrators from possessing firearms nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, persons who have a juvenile adjudication for a violent felony should not—should never—possess a firearm. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, the text of which appears below.

H.R. 5194

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Guns For Violent" Perpetrators Act".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON POSSESSION OF A FIREARM BY AN INDIVIDUAL WHO HAS COMMITTED AN ACT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY THAT WOULD BE A VIOLENT FELONY IF COMMITTED BY AN ADULT.

Section 922(g)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the comma; and

(2) by inserting "or adjudicated as having committed an act of juvenile delinquency that would be a crime of violence (as defined in section 924(c)(3)) and punishable by imprisonment for such term if committed by an adult" before the semi-colon.

#### VERMONT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT CONGRESSIONAL TOWN MEETING

#### HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 2000

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the outstanding work done by participants in my Student Congressional Town Meeting held this summer. These participants were part of a group of high school students from around Vermont who testified about the concerns they have as teenagers, and about what they would like to see the government do regarding these concerns.

I am asking that these statements be submitted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe that the views of these young persons will benefit my colleagues.

HON. BERNARD SANDERS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON BEHALF OF SCOTT DOBROWOLSKI

REGARDING GUN CONTROL—MAY 26, 2000

SCOTT DOBROWOLSKI: I come here this morning to speak on gun control, and as our schools have been noted, there is more and more shootings in our schools. Now legislation has been taking away handguns, assault rifles, many of the weapons that have been used to kill our students.

Now as I see it, I have been raised with firearms in my home and as part of this I have had a lot of training with them. I have been told right and wrong, whether or not to shoot, what to shoot. I deer hunt. Really a matter of my training as I have been told not to kill people.

As we have learned there is more and more students killing each other. A lot of these children have been decided and acquitted for not knowing the difference between killing

their student and just merely playing around.

As I see it, there should be more education in school as to avoid the shooting of their classmates. If we started at a younger age, I believe that we could severely delay the risk of having all these shootings. I am not saying hand-on experience with firearms, but more or less just education on right and wrong in our schools because apparently as we have seen, parents no longer care or they are not doing their job.

My parents at a very young age taught me the difference between right and wrong and responsibility and I feel this is not being done anymore. Frankly, I went to France and instead of fearing the fact that my plane would go down I have a greater percentage of dying in my school because one of my friends might get ticked off because I told him he looked funny and he might shoot at me. I feel this is a great danger and should be stopped at a more recent time where children are more able to be influenced by what happens in their lives.

HON. BERNARD SANDERS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON BEHALF OF NATHAN LOIZEAUX

REGARDING COLLEGE FINANCING—MAY 26, 2000

NATHAN LOIZEAUX: Thank you very much. I would like to talk to you about college financing. I am a Mt. Abraham senior right now. I will graduate this year, and I have been trying to get together finances to go to college and I am just realizing how hard it is. Yes, there are a lot of scholarships out there today. I have actually a book about this thick.

Unfortunately, once you start whittling down parents, grandparents, what activities you are involved in, your heritage, all of a sudden you find out the white male does not have to many scholarships out there, and then not only to top that off, but he has got to compete with everybody else in the state for the exact same scholarships.

Also my parents and great grandparents started a college account for me. They started saving up money for me. My parents were severely penalized for having a college savings account. I think that is totally wrong. You and people in Congress, people in government want teenagers and high school students to be able to go on to college to get a better education, and in this day and age you need a better education to get a good job. Yes, there are thousands of jobs out there for \$6 an hour.

Unfortunately, you are never going to make it out of that gene pool without a college education. Unfortunately, a college education is very expensive. Take UVM here, for instance. I work here as a temporary helper in the summer. This college just recently raised its tuition. Colleges all over the state are raising their tuition. It is harder and harder to get into a college. You want us to get a better education but are denying us the ability to do that by not giving us the funds. And when colleges are constantly bringing up their tuition to get in, it makes it all that much harder. When parents are being penalized for having the accounts for the children to set aside money to go to the college it is even worse.

In this day and age if you are on welfare you're better off. You can get into a college, no problem on welfare basically at this point because they will pay for everything to go to college. A friend of mine is on welfare right now and she got accepted to the university here, UVM, and she basically does not have